arXiv:1511.08979v1 [hep-ph] 29 Nov 2015

125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation in the $\mu\nu$SSM

Hai-Bin Zhang[a,*], Tai-Fu Feng[a,b,†], Shu-Min Zhao[a], Yu-Li Yan[a], Fei Sun[c]

[a] *Department of Physics, Hebei University, Baoding, 071002, China*

[b] *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics (KLTP), Institute of theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China*

[c] *College of Science, China Three Gorges University, Yichang, 443002, China*

Abstract

Recently, the CMS and ATLAS Collaborations have reported direct search for the 125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation, $h \to \mu\tau$, which show a slight deviation from the Standard Model (SM). In this work, we analyze the signal of the lepton flavour violating (LFV) Higgs decay $h \to \mu\tau$ in the μ from ν Supersymmetric Standard Model ($\mu\nu$SSM) with slepton flavor mixing. Simultaneously, we discuss the constraints from the LFV decay $\tau \to \mu\gamma$, the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment and the light Higgs mass.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Jv, 14.80.Da, 11.30.Fs

Keywords: Supersymmetry, Higgs decay, Lepton Flavor Violation

* Corresponding author.
email:hbzhang@hbu.edu.cn

† email:fengtf@hbu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the Higgs boson by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations [1, 2] is a great success of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). Combined the updated data of the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, the measured mass of the Higgs boson now is [3]

$$m_h = 125.09 \pm 0.24\,\text{GeV}. \tag{1}$$

In the next step, it's interesting in searching for its properties. In the Standard Model (SM), the lepton flavour violating (LFV) Higgs decays are forbidden [4]. But recently, the first direct search for the 125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation, $h \to \mu\tau$, is described by the CMS Collaboration [5]. The result shows that the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ is

$$\text{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) = (8.4^{+3.9}_{-3.7}) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{2}$$

which has a slight excess with a significance of 2.4 standard deviations at $m_h = 125$ GeV. Here, interpreted as a signal, $\mu\tau$ means the inclusive final state consisting of $\bar{\mu}\tau$ and $\mu\bar{\tau}$. The recent ATLAS measurement also reports the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ [6]

$$\text{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) = (7.7 \pm 6.2) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{3}$$

which does not show a significant deviation from the SM. Of course, it is at least consistent with the CMS result. Therefore, the experiments still need to detect more precisely in the furture.

The LFV Higgs decays can occur naturally in models beyond the SM, such as supersymmetric models [7–15], composite Higgs boson models [16, 17], Randall-Sundrum models [18–20], and many others [21–27]. Due to the running of the LHC, recently the LFV Higgs decays were discussed within various theoretical frameworks [28–52]. In this paper, we will study the LFV Higgs decay, $h \to \mu\tau$, in the "μ from ν Supersymmetric Standard Model" ($\mu\nu$SSM) [53–55]. As a extension of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [56–60], the $\mu\nu$SSM solves the μ problem [61] of the MSSM, through the R-parity breaking couplings $\lambda_i \hat{\nu}_i^c \hat{H}_d^a \hat{H}_u^b$ in the superpotential. The μ term is generated spontaneously via the nonzero vacuum expectative values (VEVs) of right-handed sneutrinos, $\mu = \lambda_i \langle \tilde{\nu}_i^c \rangle$,

when the electroweak symmetry is broken (EWSB). In addition, nonzero VEVs of sneutrinos in the $\mu\nu$SSM can generate three tiny massive Majorana neutrinos at the tree level through the seesaw machanism [53–55, 62–66].

In our previous work, we had analyzed some LFV processes $l_j^- \to l_i^-\gamma$, $l_j^- \to l_i^- l_i^- l_i^+$, muon conversion to electron in nuclei and $Z \to l_i^\pm l_j^\mp$ within the $\mu\nu$SSM [67–69]. The numerical results show that the LFV rates for $l_j - l_i$ transitions in the $\mu\nu$SSM depend on the slepton flavor mixing, and the present experimental limits for the branching ratio of $l_j^- \to l_i^-\gamma$ constrain the slepton mixing parameters most strictly [69]. In this work, considered the constraint of $\tau \to \mu\gamma$, we continue to analyze the LFV Higgs decay, $h \to \mu\tau$, in the $\mu\nu$SSM with slepton flavor mixing.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly present the $\mu\nu$SSM, including its superpotential and the general soft SUSY-breaking terms. Section III contains the analytical expressions of the 125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation in the $\mu\nu$SSM. The numerical analysis and the summary are given in Section IV and Section V, respectively.

II. THE $\mu\nu$SSM

In addition to the superfields of the MSSM, the $\mu\nu$SSM introduces right-handed neutrino superfields $\hat{\nu}_i^c$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. Besides the MSSM Yukawa couplings for quarks and charged leptons, the superpotential of the $\mu\nu$SSM contains Yukawa couplings for neutrinos, two additional types of terms involving the Higgs doublet superfields $\hat{H}_u$ and $\hat{H}_d$, and the right-handed neutrino superfields $\hat{\nu}_i^c$, [53]

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \epsilon_{ab}\left(Y_{u_{ij}}\hat{H}_u^b\hat{Q}_i^a\hat{u}_j^c + Y_{d_{ij}}\hat{H}_d^a\hat{Q}_i^b\hat{d}_j^c + Y_{e_{ij}}\hat{H}_d^a\hat{L}_i^b\hat{e}_j^c\right) \\ & +\epsilon_{ab}Y_{\nu_{ij}}\hat{H}_u^b\hat{L}_i^a\hat{\nu}_j^c - \epsilon_{ab}\lambda_i\hat{\nu}_i^c\hat{H}_d^a\hat{H}_u^b + \frac{1}{3}\kappa_{ijk}\hat{\nu}_i^c\hat{\nu}_j^c\hat{\nu}_k^c, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{H}_u^T = \left(\hat{H}_u^+, \hat{H}_u^0\right)$, $\hat{H}_d^T = \left(\hat{H}_d^0, \hat{H}_d^-\right)$, $\hat{Q}_i^T = \left(\hat{u}_i, \hat{d}_i\right)$, $\hat{L}_i^T = \left(\hat{\nu}_i, \hat{e}_i\right)$ are $SU(2)$ doublet superfields, and $\hat{u}_i^c$, $\hat{d}_i^c$, and $\hat{e}_i^c$ represent the singlet up-type quark, down-type quark and charged lepton superfields, respectively. Here, Y, λ, and κ are dimensionless matrices, a vector, and a totally symmetric tensor. And $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3$ are the generation indices, $a, b = 1, 2$ are the SU(2) indices with antisymmetric tensor $\epsilon_{12} = 1$. In this paper, the

summation convention is implied on repeated indices.

Once EWSB, the neutral scalars develop in general the VEVs:

$$\langle H_d^0 \rangle = \upsilon_d, \qquad \langle H_u^0 \rangle = \upsilon_u, \qquad \langle \tilde{\nu}_i \rangle = \upsilon_{\nu_i}, \qquad \langle \tilde{\nu}_i^c \rangle = \upsilon_{\nu_i^c}. \tag{5}$$

Then, the next two terms in the superpotential can generate the effective bilinear terms $\epsilon_{ab}\varepsilon_i \hat{H}_u^b \hat{L}_i^a$ and $\epsilon_{ab}\mu \hat{H}_d^a \hat{H}_u^b$, with $\varepsilon_i = Y_{\nu_{ij}} \left\langle \tilde{\nu}_j^c \right\rangle$ and $\mu = \lambda_i \langle \tilde{\nu}_i^c \rangle$. In the superpotential, Eq. (4), the last term generates the effective Majorana masses for neutrinos at the electroweak scale, and the last two terms explicitly violate lepton number and R-parity.

In the framework of supergravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking, the general soft SUSY-breaking terms of the $\mu\nu$SSM are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_{soft} = & \, m^2_{\tilde{Q}_{ij}} \tilde{Q}_i^{a*} \tilde{Q}_j^a + m^2_{\tilde{u}^c_{ij}} \tilde{u}_i^{c*} \tilde{u}_j^c + m^2_{\tilde{d}^c_{ij}} \tilde{d}_i^{c*} \tilde{d}_j^c + m^2_{\tilde{L}_{ij}} \tilde{L}_i^{a*} \tilde{L}_j^a \\
& + m^2_{\tilde{e}^c_{ij}} \tilde{e}_i^{c*} \tilde{e}_j^c + m^2_{H_d} H_d^{a*} H_d^a + m^2_{H_u} H_u^{a*} H_u^a + m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_{ij}} \tilde{\nu}_i^{c*} \tilde{\nu}_j^c \\
& + \epsilon_{ab} \Big[(A_u Y_u)_{ij} H_u^b \tilde{Q}_i^a \tilde{u}_j^c + (A_d Y_d)_{ij} H_d^a \tilde{Q}_i^b \tilde{d}_j^c + (A_e Y_e)_{ij} H_d^a \tilde{L}_i^b \tilde{e}_j^c + \text{H.c.} \Big] \\
& + \left[\epsilon_{ab} (A_\nu Y_\nu)_{ij} H_u^b \tilde{L}_i^a \tilde{\nu}_j^c - \epsilon_{ab} (A_\lambda \lambda)_i \tilde{\nu}_i^c H_d^a H_u^b + \frac{1}{3} (A_\kappa \kappa)_{ijk} \tilde{\nu}_i^c \tilde{\nu}_j^c \tilde{\nu}_k^c + \text{H.c.} \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \left(M_3 \tilde{\lambda}_3 \tilde{\lambda}_3 + M_2 \tilde{\lambda}_2 \tilde{\lambda}_2 + M_1 \tilde{\lambda}_1 \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \text{H.c.} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Here, the first two lines contain mass squared terms of squarks, sleptonsm, Higgses, and sneutrinos. The next two lines include the trilinear scalar couplings. In the last line, M_3, M_2, and M_1 denote Majorana masses corresponding to $SU(3)$, $SU(2)$, and $U(1)$ gauginos $\hat{\lambda}_3$, $\hat{\lambda}_2$, and $\hat{\lambda}_1$, respectively. In addition to the terms from $\mathcal{L}_{soft}$, the tree-level scalar potential receives the usual D- and F-term contributions [54].

III. 125 GEV HIGGS DECAY WITH LEPTON FLAVOR VIOLATION

The Feynman diagrams for 125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation $h \to \bar{l}_i l_j$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM are depicted by Fig. 1. And the corresponding effective amplitude for $h \to \bar{l}_i l_j$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{M} = \bar{l}_i (F_L^{ij} P_L + F_R^{ij} P_R) l_j, \tag{7}$$



FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams for $h \to \bar{l}_i l_j$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM. (a) represents the contributions from charged scalars $S^-_{\alpha,\rho}$ and neutral fermions χ^0_η loops, while (b) represents the contributions from neutral scalars N_α ($N = S, P$) and charged fermions $\chi_{\beta,\zeta}$ loops.

with

$$F^{ij}_{L,R} = F^{(c)ij}_{L,R} + F^{(n)ij}_{L,R}, \tag{8}$$

where $F^{(c)ij}_{L,R}$ denote the contributions from the virtual charged scalar loops, and $F^{(n)ij}_{L,R}$ stand for the contributions from the virtual neutral scalar loops, respectively. After integrating the heavy freedoms out, we formulate those coefficients as follows:

$$F^{(c)ij}_L = \frac{m_{\chi^0_\eta} C^{S^\pm}_{1\alpha\rho}}{m^2_W} C^{S^-_\rho \chi^0_\eta \bar{l}_i}_L C^{S^{-*}_\alpha l_j \bar{\chi}^0_\eta}_L G_1(x_{\chi^0_\eta}, x_{S^-_\alpha}, x_{S^-_\rho}), \tag{9}$$

$$F^{(n)ij}_L = \sum_{N=S,P} \Big[\frac{m_{\chi_\zeta} m_{\chi_\beta}}{m^2_W} C^{N_\alpha \chi_\zeta \bar{l}_i}_L C^{h\chi_\beta \bar{\chi}_\zeta}_L C^{N_\alpha l_j \bar{\chi}_\beta}_L G_1(x_{N_\alpha}, x_{\chi_\zeta}, x_{\chi_\beta}) + C^{N_\alpha \chi_\zeta \bar{l}_i}_L C^{h\chi_\beta \bar{\chi}_\zeta}_R C^{N_\alpha l_j \bar{\chi}_\beta}_L G_2(x_{N_\alpha}, x_{\chi_\zeta}, x_{\chi_\beta}) \Big], \tag{10}$$

$$F^{(c,n)ij}_R = F^{(c,n)ij}_L \Big|_{L \leftrightarrow R}. \tag{11}$$

Here, the concrete expressions for couplings C can be found in Refs. [68–70], $x = m^2/m^2_W$ and m is the mass for the corresponding particle. And the form factors G_i are given by

$$G_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \Big[\frac{x_1 \ln x_1}{(x_1 - x_2)(x_1 - x_3)} + \frac{x_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)(x_2 - x_3)} + \frac{x_3 \ln x_3}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2)} \Big], \tag{12}$$

$$G_2(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \Big[\frac{x^2_1 \ln x_1}{(x_1 - x_2)(x_1 - x_3)} + \frac{x^2_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)(x_2 - x_3)} + \frac{x^2_3 \ln x_3}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2)} \Big]. \tag{13}$$

Then, we can obtain the decay width of $h \to \bar{l}_i l_j$ [7, 12]

$$\Gamma(h \to \bar{l}_i l_j) = \frac{m_h}{16\pi}\Big(\big|F_L^{ij}\big|^2 + \big|F_R^{ij}\big|^2\Big). \tag{14}$$

If interpreted as a signal, the branching ratio of $h \to l_i l_j$ is

$$\mathrm{Br}(h \to l_i l_j) = \Big[\Gamma(h \to \bar{l}_i l_j) + \Gamma(h \to l_i \bar{l}_j)\Big]/\Gamma_h, \tag{15}$$

where Γ_h denotes the total decay width of 125 GeV Higgs boson. In the numerical calculation, we choose $\Gamma_h \simeq 4.1 \times 10^{-3}\,\mathrm{GeV}$ [71].

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In order to obtain a more transparent numerical results, we take the minimal flavor violation (MFV) assumptions for some parameters in the $\mu\nu$SSM, which assume

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa_{ijk} = \kappa\delta_{ij}\delta_{jk}, \quad (A_\kappa\kappa)_{ijk} = A_\kappa\kappa\delta_{ij}\delta_{jk}, \quad \lambda_i = \lambda, \qquad (A_\lambda\lambda)_i = A_\lambda\lambda,\\
&Y_{u_{ij}} = Y_{u_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad (A_uY_u)_{ij} = A_{u_i}Y_{u_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad Y_{\nu_{ij}} = Y_{\nu_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad (A_\nu Y_\nu)_{ij} = a_{\nu_i}\delta_{ij},\\
&Y_{d_{ij}} = Y_{d_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad (A_dY_d)_{ij} = A_{d_i}Y_{d_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad Y_{e_{ij}} = Y_{e_i}\delta_{ij}, \qquad \upsilon_{\nu_i^c} = \upsilon_{\nu^c},\\
&m^2_{\tilde{Q}_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{Q}_i}\delta_{ij}, \qquad m^2_{\tilde{u}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{u}^c_i}\delta_{ij}, \qquad m^2_{\tilde{d}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{d}^c_i}\delta_{ij}, \qquad m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_i}\delta_{ij},
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $i,\ j,\ k = 1,\ 2,\ 3$.

For soft breaking slepton mass matrices $m^2_{\tilde{L},\tilde{e}^c}$ and trilinear coupling matrix (A_eY_e), we will introduce the slepton flavor mixings, which take into account the off-diagonal terms for the matrices and are defined as [72–77]

$$m^2_{\tilde{L}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \delta^{LL}_{12} & \delta^{LL}_{13} \\ \delta^{LL}_{12} & 1 & \delta^{LL}_{23} \\ \delta^{LL}_{13} & \delta^{LL}_{23} & 1 \end{pmatrix} m^2_L, \tag{17}$$

$$m^2_{\tilde{e}^c} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \delta^{RR}_{12} & \delta^{RR}_{13} \\ \delta^{RR}_{12} & 1 & \delta^{RR}_{23} \\ \delta^{RR}_{13} & \delta^{RR}_{23} & 1 \end{pmatrix} m^2_E, \tag{18}$$

$$(A_eY_e) = \begin{pmatrix} m_{l_1}A_e & \delta^{LR}_{12}m_Lm_E & \delta^{LR}_{13}m_Lm_E \\ \delta^{LR}_{12}m_Lm_E & m_{l_2}A_e & \delta^{LR}_{23}m_Lm_E \\ \delta^{LR}_{13}m_Lm_E & \delta^{LR}_{23}m_Lm_E & m_{l_3}A_e \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\upsilon_d}. \tag{19}$$

The following numerical results will show that the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ depends on the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$.

Before calculation, the constraints on the parameters of the $\mu\nu$SSM from some experiments should be considered at first. Through our previous work [69], we have detailedly discuss that the neutrino experimental data constrain neutrino Yukawa couplings $Y_{\nu_i} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ and left-handed sneutrino VEVs $\upsilon_{\nu_i} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4}\text{GeV})$. Here, due that neutrino sector weakly affect $h \to \mu\tau$, we could take no account of the constraints from neutrino experimental data.

The neutral Higgs with mass around 125 GeV reported by ATLAS and CMS contributes a strict constraint on relevant parameter space of the model. Due to the introduction of some new couplings in the superpotential, the SM-like Higgs mass in the $\mu\nu$SSM gets additional contribution at tree-level [54]. For large mass of the pseudoscalar M_A and moderate $\tan\beta$, the SM-like Higgs mass in the $\mu\nu$SSM is approximately given by [78]

$$m_h^2 \simeq m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \frac{6\lambda^2 s_W^2 c_W^2}{e^2} m_Z^2 \sin^2 2\beta + \triangle m_h^2. \tag{20}$$

Compared with the MSSM, the $\mu\nu$SSM gets an additional term, $\frac{6\lambda^2 s_W^2 c_W^2}{e^2} m_Z^2 \sin^2 2\beta$. Thus, the SM-like Higgs in the $\mu\nu$SSM can easily account for the mass around 125 GeV, especially for small $\tan\beta$. Including two-loop leading-log effects, the main radiative corrections $\triangle m_h^2$ can be given as [79–81]

$$\triangle\, m_h^2 = \frac{3m_t^4}{4\pi^2\upsilon^2}\Big[(t + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{X}_t) + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\frac{3m_t^2}{2\upsilon^2} - 32\pi\alpha_3)(t^2 + \tilde{X}_t t)\Big], \tag{21}$$

with

$$t = \log\frac{M_S^2}{m_t^2}, \qquad \tilde{X}_t = \frac{2\tilde{A}_t^2}{M_S^2}\Big(1 - \frac{\tilde{A}_t^2}{12M_S^2}\Big), \tag{22}$$

where $\upsilon = 174$ GeV, α_3 is the strong coupling constant, $M_S = \sqrt{m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}}$ with $m_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}$ denoting the stop masses, $\tilde{A}_t = A_t - \mu\cot\beta$ with $A_t = A_{u_3}$ being the trilinear Higgs-stop coupling and $\mu = 3\lambda\upsilon_{\nu^c}$ denoting the Higgsino mass parameter.

We also impose a constraint on the SUSY contribution to the muon magnetic dipole moment a_μ in the $\mu\nu$SSM [67]. The difference between experiment and the SM prediction on a_μ is [82–84]

$$\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = (24.8 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-10}, \tag{23}$$



FIG. 2: $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ respectively versus slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{RR} (a), δ_{23}^{LL} (b), and δ_{23}^{LR} (c), where the solid lines stand for $\tan\beta = 40$ and the dashed lines stand for $\tan\beta = 10$. $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ respectively versus slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{RR} (d), δ_{23}^{LL} (e), and δ_{23}^{LR} (f), where the solid lines stand for $\tan\beta = 40$, the dashed lines stand for $\tan\beta = 10$, and the dot-dashed lines and the dotted lines denote the present limits and the future sensitivities.

with all errors combined in quadrature. Therefore, the SUSY contribution to a_μ in the $\mu\nu$SSM should be constrained as $1.1 \times 10^{-10} \leq \Delta a_\mu \leq 48.5 \times 10^{-10}$, where a 3σ experimental error is considered. In Ref. [67], we can know that the experimental data for a_μ will give a large constraint on the parameter M_2, for a given value of $\tan\beta$.

Through our previous work in Ref. [69], we could choose the reasonable values for some parameters as $\kappa = 0.4$, $\lambda = 0.1$, $A_\lambda = 500$ GeV, $A_\kappa = -300$ GeV and $m_L = m_E = A_e = 1$ TeV for simplicity in the following numerical calculation. For the Majorana masses of the gauginos, we will imply the approximate GUT relation $M_1 = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_2^2} M_2 \approx 0.5 M_2$ and $M_3 = \frac{\alpha_3^2}{\alpha_2^2} M_2 \approx 2.7 M_2$. The gluino mass, $m_{\tilde{g}} \approx M_3$, is larger than about 1.2 TeV from the experimental data of the ATLAS and CMS [85–88]. Simultaneously, considered the experimental constraints of Δa_μ, we conservatively choose $M_2 = 2$ TeV. The third generation squark masses are not constrained by the LHC as strongly as the first two generations, and affect the SM-like Higgs mass. Therefore, we could adopt $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = m_{\tilde{u}_3^c} = m_{\tilde{d}_3^c} = 1$ TeV. Next, as key parameters, $\tan\beta$ and A_t, affect the SM-like Higgs mass.

It's well known that the LFV processes are flavor dependent. The LFV rates for $\mu - \tau$ transitions depend on the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$, which can be numerically confirmed by Fig. 2. The slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$ don't contribute to the SM-like Higgs mass m_h and the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment Δa_μ. Therefore, in Fig. 2, we could properly choose $\tan\beta = 40$ and $A_t = 1$ TeV (solid lines), or $\tan\beta = 10$ and $A_t = 1.3$ TeV (dashed lines), to keep the SM-like Higgs mass m_h around 125 GeV and $1.1 \times 10^{-10} \leq \Delta a_\mu \leq 48.5 \times 10^{-10}$. Here, we also could appropriately take $\upsilon_{\nu^c} = 8$ TeV to hope that $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ could be more large, which will be seen in Fig. 4. In Fig. 2, we plot $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ respectively varying with the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{RR} (a), δ_{23}^{LL} (b), and δ_{23}^{LR} (c). Here, when $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ versus one slepton mixing parameter, the other slepton mixing parameters are chosen to be zero. The numerical results show that $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ is quickly increasing, along with increasing of slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$. $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ for $\tan\beta = 40$ is large about one order of magnitude than that for $\tan\beta = 10$. When $\tan\beta = 40$, we see that $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ can reach $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$ as $\delta_{23}^{RR} = 0.5$ or $\delta_{23}^{LL} = 0.5$, and $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) = \mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ for $\delta_{23}^{LR} = 0.5$.

Of course, we need take into account the other LFV rates for $\mu - \tau$ transitions. In our previous work [69], the present experimental limit for the branching ratio of $\tau \to \mu\gamma$ constrains the slepton mixing parameters most strictly, compared with $\tau \to 3\mu$ and $Z \to \mu\tau$. Therefore, in Fig. 2, we also plot $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ varying with the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{RR} (d), δ_{23}^{LL} (e), and δ_{23}^{LR} (f), respectively. Here the dot-dashed lines denote the present



FIG. 3: (a) $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ versus $\tan\beta$. (b) $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ versus $\tan\beta$, where the dot-dashed line denotes the present limit and the dotted line denotes the future sensitivity. (c) the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment Δa_μ versus $\tan\beta$, where gray area denotes the Δa_μ at 3.0 standard deviations. (d) the light Higgs mass m_h versus $\tan\beta$, where gray area denotes the m_h at 3.0 standard deviations.

limit of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ [89]:

$$\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma) < 4.4 \times 10^{-8}, \tag{24}$$

and the dotted lines denote the future sensitivity of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma) \sim 10^{-9}$ [90]. It also indicates that $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ is increasing quickly, along with increasing of slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$. When $\tan\beta = 40$, $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ easily exceed the present limit as $\delta_{23}^{XX} = 0.5$ $(X = L, R)$, and the present limit of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ constrains $\delta_{23}^{RR} \lesssim 0.3$, $\delta_{23}^{LL} \lesssim 0.05$, and $\delta_{23}^{LR} \lesssim 0.015$, respectively. Under the constraint of the present limit of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$, when $\tan\beta = 40$, we could see that $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) \approx 10^{-6}$ for $\delta_{23}^{RR} = 0.3$, $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) \approx 4 \times 10^{-8}$ for $\delta_{23}^{LL} = 0.05$, and $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau) \approx 4 \times 10^{-11}$ for $\delta_{23}^{LR} = 0.015$.



FIG. 4: (a) Br($h \to \mu\tau$) versus v_{ν^c}. (b) Br($\tau \to \mu\gamma$) versus v_{ν^c}, where the dot-dashed line denotes the present limit and the dotted line denotes the future sensitivity. (c) the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment Δa_μ versus v_{ν^c}, where gray area denotes the Δa_μ at 3.0 standard deviations. (d) the light Higgs mass m_h versus v_{ν^c}, where gray area denotes the m_h at 3.0 standard deviations.

Through Fig. 2, we could choose the appropriate value of δ_{23}^{RR} to obtain Br($h \to \mu\tau$) as large as possible, under the constraint of the present limit of Br($\tau \to \mu\gamma$). Thus, we can take $\delta_{23}^{RR} = 0.5$ and $A_t = 1$ TeV, to study the influences of two interesting parameters $\tan\beta$ and the right-handed sneutrino VEV v_{ν^c}. At first, choosing $v_{\nu^c} = 2$ TeV, we show Br($h \to \mu\tau$) versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig. 3(a). When $\tan\beta$ increases to 60 from small value, Br($h \to \mu\tau$) enlarges three orders of magnitude. We also plot Br($\tau \to \mu\gamma$) varying with $\tan\beta$ in Fig. 3(b), where the dot-dashed line denotes the present limit and the dotted line denotes the future sensitivity. We can see that the present limit of Br($\tau \to \mu\gamma$) constrains $\tan\beta < 40$. In Fig. 3(c), the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment Δa_μ at 3.0 standard deviations also constrains $\tan\beta \lesssim 40$. In Fig. 3(d), the light Higgs mass m_h hard reaches 125 GeV, when

$\tan\beta \lesssim 10$.

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, right-handed sneutrinos are introduced to solve μ problem. Once EWSB, right-handed sneutrinos obtain the nonzero VEVs. Then, it can generate $\mu = \lambda_i \upsilon_{\nu_i^c}$. Through the assumptions in Eq. (16), here $\mu = 3\lambda\upsilon_{\nu^c}$. At the last, taking $\tan\beta = 20$, we picture $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ varying with the right-handed sneutrino VEV υ_{ν^c} in Fig. 4(a). The numerical result indicate that $\mathrm{Br}(h \to \mu\tau)$ increases, when υ_{ν^c} increases. In Fig. 4(b), we also depict $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$ versus $\tan\beta$, where the dot-dashed line denotes the present limit and the dotted line denotes the future sensitivity. There is a resonating absorption around $\upsilon_{\nu^c} \approx 4$ TeV that originates from the interference from the corrections of charged scalars and neutral fermions loops. Constrained by the present limit of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$, the VEV $\upsilon_{\nu^c} \lesssim 9$ TeV. In Fig. 4, the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment Δa_μ versus υ_{ν^c} (c), and the light Higgs mass m_h versus υ_{ν^c} (d), where gray area denote experimental values at 3.0 standard deviations. With increasing of υ_{ν^c}, Δa_μ is gentle, and m_h is decreasing slowly.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper, we study the 125 GeV Higgs decay with lepton flavor violation, $h \to \mu\tau$, in the framwork of the $\mu\nu$SSM with slepton flavor mixing. The numerical results show that the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ depends on the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$, because the LFV processes are flavor dependent. And the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ is increasing, with increasing of δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$, $\tan\beta$ and right-handed sneutrino VEV υ_{ν^c}. Under the experimental constraints of the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment, the light Higgs mass around 125 GeV and especially the present limit of $\mathrm{Br}(\tau \to \mu\gamma)$, the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ can reach $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$, which enlarges greatly compared with the SM, but still remain below the present experimental measurements. Through the assumptions in Eq. (16), we choose $Y_{e_{ij}} = Y_{e_i}\delta_{ij}$, and $\mu - \tau$ Yukawa coupling $Y_{e_{23}} = 0$. Therefore, here the branching ratio of $h \to \mu\tau$ is dominated by the slepton mixing parameters δ_{23}^{XX} $(X = L, R)$. It's well known that the lepton flavor violating processes are hard detected. Considered that the recent ATLAS measurement for $h \to \mu\tau$ does not show a significant deviation from the SM, the experiments still need to detect more precisely in the furture.

Acknowledgments

The work has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) with Grant No. 11275036, No. 11535002, the Open Project Program of State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China (No. Y5KF131CJ1), the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei province with Grant No. A2013201277, the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei University with Grants No. 2011JQ05, No. 2012-242, and Hebei Key Lab of Optic-Eletronic Information and Meterials.

---

[1] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 1, arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex].

[2] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 30, arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex].

[3] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS and CMS Collaborations), Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015) 191803, arXiv:1503.07589 [hep-ex].

[4] R. Harnik, J. Kopp, and J. Zupan, JHEP 03 (2013) 026, arXiv:1209.1397.

[5] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 749 (2015) 337-362, arXiv:1502.07400 [hep-ex].

[6] G. Aad et al. (CMS Collaboration), CERN-PH-EP-2015-184, arXiv:1508.03372 [hep-ex].

[7] J. L. Diaz-Cruz, and J. J. Toscano, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 116005, arXiv:hep-ph/9910233.

[8] T. Han, and D. Marfatia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 1442, arXiv:hep-ph/0008141.

[9] J. L. Diaz-Cruz, JHEP 05 (2003) 036.

[10] A. Brignole, and A. Rossi, Phys. Lett. B 566 (2003) 217-225.

[11] A. Brignole, and A. Rossi, Nucl. Phys. B 701 (2004) 3-53.

[12] E. Arganda, A. M. Curiel, M. J. Herrero, and D. Temes, Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 035011.

[13] J. K. Parry, Nucl. Phys. B 760 (2007) 38-63.

[14] J. L. Diaz-Cruz, D. K. Ghosh, and S. Moretti, Phys. Lett. B 679 (2009) 376-381.

[15] A. Arhrib, Y. Cheng, and O. C. W. Kong, Phys. Rev. D 87 (2013) 015025, arXiv:1210.8241.

[16] K. Agashe, and R. Contino, Phys. Rev. D 80 (2009) 075016, arXiv:0906.1542.

[17] A. Azatov, M. Toharia, and L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D 80 (2009) 035016, arXiv:0906.1990.

[18] S. Casagrande et al., JHEP 10 (2008) 094, arXiv:0807.4937.

[19] G. Perez, and L. Randall, JHEP 01 (2009) 077, arXiv:0805.4652.

[20] A. J. Buras, B. Duling, and S. Gori, JHEP 09 (2009) 076, arXiv:0905.2318.

[21] M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, B. Duling, S. Gori, and A. Weiler, JHEP 03 (2009) 001, arXiv:0809.1073.

[22] G. F. Giudice, and O. Lebedev, Phys. Lett. B 665 (2008) 79, arXiv:0804.1753.

[23] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Nucl. Phys. B 821 (2009) 215, arXiv:0904.2387.

[24] M. E. Albrecht, M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, B. Duling, and K. Gemmler, JHEP 09 (2009) 064, arXiv:0903.2415.

[25] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu, and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 183 (2010) 1, arXiv:1003.3552.

[26] A. Goudelis, O. Lebedev, and J. H. Park, Phys. Lett. B 707 (2012) 369, arXiv:1111.1715.

[27] D. McKeen, M. Pospelov, and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 113004, arXiv:1208.4597.

[28] G. Blankenburg, J. Ellis, and G. Isidori, Phys. Lett. B 712 (2012) 386-390, arXiv:1202.5704.

[29] A. Arhrib, Y. Cheng, and O. C. W. Kong, Europhys. Lett. 101 (2013) 31003, arXiv:1208.4669.

[30] A. Dery, A. Efrati, Y. Hochberg, and Y. Nir, JHEP 05 (2013) 039, arXiv:1302.3229.

[31] M. Arana-Catania, E. Arganda, and M. Herrero, JHEP 09 (2013) 160, arXiv:1304.3371.

[32] M. Arroyo, J. L. Diaz-Cruz, E. Diaz, and J. A. Orduz-Ducuara, arXiv:1306.2343.

[33] A. Celis, V. Cirigliano, and E. Passemar, Phys. Rev. D 89 (2014) 013008, arXiv:1309.3564.

[34] A. Falkowski, D. M. Straub, and A. Vicente, JHEP 05 (2014) 092, arXiv:1312.5329.

[35] A. Dery, A. Efrati, Y. Nir, Y. Soreq, and V. Susič, Phys. Rev. D 90 (2014) 115022, arXiv:1408.1371.

[36] M. D. Campos, A. E. C. Hernández, H. Päs, and E. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. D 91 (2015) 116011, arXiv:1408.1652.

[37] J. Heeck, M. Holthausen, W. Rodejohann, and Y. Shimizu, Nucl. Phys. B 896 (2015) 281-310, arXiv:1412.3671.

[38] A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio, and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015) 151801,

arXiv:1501.00993.

[39] I. Dorner, S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik, N. Konik, and I. Niandic, JHEP 06 (2015) 108, arXiv:1502.07784.

[40] Y. Omura, E. Senaha, and K. Tobe, JHEP 05 (2015) 028, arXiv:1502.07824.

[41] A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio, and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. D 91 (2015) 075006, arXiv:1503.03477.

[42] A. Vicente, Adv. High Energy Phys. 2015 (2015) 686572, arXiv:1503.08622.

[43] F. Bishara, J. Brod, P. Uttayarat, and J. Zupan, arXiv:1504.04022.

[44] X.-G. He, J. Tandean, and Y.-J. Zheng, JHEP 09 (2015) 093, arXiv:1507.02673.

[45] W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori, A. L. Kagan, L. Silvestrini, and J. Zupan, arXiv:1507.07927.

[46] K. Cheung, W.-Y. Keung, and P.-Y. Tseng, arXiv:1508.01897.

[47] E. Arganda, M. J. Herrero, X. Marcano, and C. Weiland, arXiv:1508.04623.

[48] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. Nebot, and M. N. Rebelo, arXiv:1508.05101.

[49] X. Liu, L. Bian, X.-Q. Li, and J. Shu, arXiv:1508.05716.

[50] S. Baek and K. Nishiwaki, arXiv:1509.07410.

[51] E. Arganda, M.J. Herrero, R. Morales, and A. Szynkman, arXiv:1510.04685.

[52] D. Aloni, Y. Niry, and E. Stamouz, arXiv:1511.00979.

[53] D. E. López-Fogliani, and C. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 041801, hep-ph/0508297.

[54] N. Escudero, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, and R. Ruiz de Austri, JHEP 12 (2008) 099 arXiv:0810.1507.

[55] J. Fidalgo, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, and R. Ruiz de Austri, JHEP 10 (2011) 020 arXiv:1107.4614.

[56] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. 110 (1984) 1.

[57] H. E. Haber, and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rept. 117 (1985) 75.

[58] H .E. Haber, hep-ph/9306207.

[59] S. P. Martin, hep-ph/9709356.

[60] J. Rosiek, Phys. Rev. D 41 (1990) 3464, hep-ph/9511250.

[61] J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. B 138 (1984) 150.

[62] P. Ghosh, and S. Roy, JHEP 04 (2009) 069, arXiv:0812.0084.

[63] A. Bartl, M. Hirsch, S. Liebler, W. Porodc, and A. Vicente, JHEP 05 (2009)

120,arXiv:0903.3596.

[64] J. Fidalgo, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, and R. R. de Austri, JHEP 08 (2009) 105, arXiv:0904.3112.

[65] P. Ghosh, P. Dey, B. Mukhopadhyaya, and S. Roy, JHEP 05 (2010) 087, arXiv:1002.2705.

[66] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, L.-N. Kou, and S.-M. Zhao, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 28 (2013) 1350117, arXiv:1307.6284.

[67] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, S.-M. Zhao, and T.-J. Gao, Nucl. Phys. B 873 (2013) 300 [Erratum-ibid. 879 (2014) 235], arXiv:1304.6248.

[68] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, G.-F. Luo, Z.-F. Ge, and S.-M. Zhao, JHEP 07 (2013) 069 [Erratum-ibid. 10 (2013) 173], arXiv:1305.4352.

[69] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, S.-M. Zhao, and Fei Sun, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 29 (2014) 1450123, arXiv:1407.7365.

[70] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, F. Sun, K.-S. Sun, J.-B. Chen, and S.-M. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D 89 (2014) 115007, arXiv:1307.3607.

[71] S. Heinemeyer et al. (LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group), CERN-2013-004, arXiv:1307.1347 [hep-ph].

[72] M. Misiak, S. Pokorski, and J. Rosiek, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. 15 (1998) 795, hep-ph/9703442.

[73] P. Paradisi, JHEP 10 (2005) 006, hep-ph/0505046.

[74] J. Girrbach, S. Mertens, U. Nierste, and S. Wiesenfeldt, JHEP 05 (2010) 026, arXiv:0910.2663.

[75] J. Rosiek, P. H. Chankowski, A. Dedes, S. Jäger, and P. Tanedo, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 2180, arXiv:1003.4260.

[76] M. Arana-Catania, S. Heinemeyer, and M. J. Herrero, Phys. Rev. D 88 (2013) 015026, arXiv:1304.2783.

[77] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, Z.-F. Ge, and S.-M. Zhao, JHEP 02 (2014) 012, arXiv:1401.2704.

[78] H.-B. Zhang, G.-L. Luo, T.-F. Feng, S.-M. Zhao, T.-J. Gao, and K.-S. Sun, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 29 (2014) 1450196, arXiv:1409.6837.

[79] M. Carena, J. R. Espinosa, M. Quirós, and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 355 (1995) 209.

[80] M. Carena, M. Quirós, and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B 461 (1996) 407.

[81] M. Carena, S. Gori, N. R. Shah, and C. E. M. Wagner, JHEP 03 (2012) 014.

[82] K. A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C 38 (2014) 090001.

[83] G. W. Bennett et al. (Muon (g-2) Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 072003.

[84] P. J. Mohr, B. N. Taylor, and D. B. Newell, Rev. Mod. Phys. 80 (2008) 633.

[85] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 092002.

[86] ATLAS Collaboration, JHEP 10 (2013) 130.

[87] CMS Collaboration, JHEP 01 (2013) 077.

[88] CMS Collaboration, JHEP 07 (2013) 122.

[89] B. Aubert et al. (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 104 (2010) 021802, arXiv:0908.2381.

[90] K. Hayasaka (Belle and Belle II Collaboration), J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 408 (2013) 012069.